

Appl. No. 10/707,438

Amdt. dated October 20, 2006

Reply to Office action of September 29, 2006

## REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 13-24 are pending in this response. Claims 1-9 and 13-18 are allowed. Claim 19 is amended to correct some typo errors.

5 **Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jagger et al. (US Patent No. 6,807,405)**

Firstly, Applicant has to apologize for making some typo errors in the previously presented claim 19. The limitation “first local oscillating signal” should be corrected as 10 “first oscillating signal” to comply with the former basis, and the limitation “passed intermediate frequency signal” should be corrected as “received RF signal” to realize the remarks made in the previous response.

As mentioned in the remarks of the previous response to the office action mailed 2006/05/16, the discussion of claim 19 is similar to the discussion of claim 16, which is 15 shown below:

Claim 16 recites:

Claim 16 (New): The TV tuner of claim 1, further comprising a first local oscillator for providing a first local oscillating signal to the first mixer, wherein the frequency range of the first local oscillating signal is narrower than the frequency range of the received RF signal.

(Emphasis added)

An embodiment of this claimed invention could be referred to fig. 6 of the specification. The oscillator 604 of fig. 6 corresponding to the first local oscillator of claim 16 provides an 25 oscillating signal with a frequency range 635~1040MHz while the RF signal RF\_IN of fig. 6 has a frequency range 50~860MHz (Specification: Fig. 6). Since the frequency range 635~1040MHz of the oscillating signal is narrower than the frequency range 50~860MHz of

Appl. No. 10/707,438

Amdt. dated October 20, 2006

Reply to Office action of September 29, 2006

the RF signal RF IN, the limitations recited by the wherein clause of claim 16 are fully disclosed by the specification.

From the discussion of claim 16 and the mentioned relation between claims 16 and 19, it  
5 is clearly understood that the limitation “passed intermediate frequency signal” of the previously presented claim 19 should be corrected as “received RF signal”, so as to make sense of the remarks of the previous response. Since those typo errors of the previously presented claim 19 were indicated by the corresponding remarks, the amendment to the claim 19 does not raise new issues.

10 As for the 102(b) rejection, Jagger et al. at least fail to teach or suggest the limitations “the frequency range of the first local oscillating signal is narrower than the frequency range of the received RF signal”, and thereby claim 19 is allowable over Jagger et al.. As claims 20-24 are dependent upon claim 19, if claim 19 is found to be allowable, so too should the dependent claims.

15

Reconsideration of claims 19-24 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/707,438

Amdt. dated October 20, 2006

Reply to Office action of September 29, 2006

Sincerely yours,

*Winston Hsu*

Date: 10/20/2006

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526  
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.  
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562  
Facsimile: 806-498-6673  
e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)